



IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
BEAUFORT DIVISION

EMMANUEL FRIERSON,
Plaintiff,

vs.

DEPUTY T.J. MILES et al.,
Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 9:07-3173-HFF-GCK

ORDER

This case was filed as a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. Plaintiff is proceeding pro se. The matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge suggesting that this action be dismissed for lack of prosecution. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on February 25, 2008, but Plaintiff failed to file any objections to the Report.* In the absence of such objections, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court that this action be **DISMISSED** for lack of prosecution.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 19th day of March, 2008, in Spartanburg, South Carolina.

s/ Henry F. Floyd
HENRY F. FLOYD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within 30 days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

*The Court notes that Plaintiff is likely unaware of the Report because, on March 10, 2008, Plaintiff's copy of the Report was returned to the Clerk of Court, marked "Released" and "RETURN TO SENDER/ATTEMPTED NOT KNOWN/UNABLE TO FORWARD." In light of the record in this case, however, and Plaintiff's failure to keep the Court apprised of his current mailing address pursuant to the Court's October 2, 2007, Order, the Court has no option but to dismiss the action.